

REMARKS:

SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS

The Applicants have amended the specification to correct a minor typographical error. Specifically, the applicants have changed "804" to --904-- and "808" to --908-- at page 5 21, line 13. The Applicants submit that the typographical nature of this error is apparent from the original paragraph. As such, no new matter has been entered with this amendment.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The Applicants have amended claims **11**, **61** and **73** to correct minor informalities and 10 typographical errors. Specifically, the Applicants have capitalized the word "the" at the beginning of claim **11**. The Applicants have also added the words --beam steering modules-- after "first and second" in claim **61**. In addition, the Applicants have amended claim **73** to depend from claim **72** and recite that it is the calibration light source that provides the fixed frequency light. The Applicants submit that these features are 15 apparent from the claims as originally written. As such, the amendments merely make explicit that which was implicit in the claims as originally filed. Therefore, the Applicants submit no new matter is being entered with these amendments. Furthermore, the Applicants submit that these amendments do not narrow the scope of any limitation or element of claim **11**, **61** or **73** within the meaning of the decision in *Festo Corp. v.* 20 *Shoketsu Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.*, 234 F3d 558, 566, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 535 U.S. 722, 152 L. Ed. 2d 944, 122 S. Ct. 1831, (2002).

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims **1-100** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly 25 anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,253,001 to Hoen. (hereinafter Hoen).

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner makes no arguments and points to no particular teaching of Hoen that shows all the features of the rejected claims. Specifically, the Examiner has shown no teaching of Hoen of a module "that can *co-operate interchangeably* with one or more optical

components in an optical beam steering device” as recited in independent claims 1, 42 and 67. In the absence of such a teaching, the applicants submit that Hoen does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 42 and 67 and, as such, Hoen does not anticipate these claims. Furthermore, claims 2-41, 43-66 and 68-100 respectively depend, either
5 directly or indirectly from claims 1, 42 and 67 and recite additional features therefor. As such and for the same reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that these dependent claims define an invention suitable for patent protection.


OTHER REFERENCES CITED

The Examiner has cited US Patent 6,480,645 to Peale et al, 6,483,961 to Helkley et al.,
10 6,507,683 to Sugitatsu et al. and 6,522,802 to Hoen as disclosing an MxN optical matrix switch. The Applicants submit that these references do not teach or suggest all the features of claims 1-100 as the presently stand in the application.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that are allowable over the cited art
15 and define an invention suitable for patent protection. The Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment reconsideration of the application and that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance in the next office action.

Respectfully submitted,

20 

Joshua D. Isenberg
Reg. No. 41,088
Patent Agent

Date: 8/25/2003

25 JDI PATENT
204 Castro Lane
Fremont, CA 94539
tel.: (510) 896-8328
fax.: (510) 360-9656